(23)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Single Bench : Hon'ble Shri H.L. Dattu, C.J.

Writ Petition No.2974 of 2003

Petitioner Smt. Sadhna Aklesh Shrivastava, aged about 38 years, W/o Aklesh Shrivastava, R/o Shri A.K.Shrivastava, Sub-Engineer, P.W.D., Bhatapara, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)

versus

Respondents

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Women & Child Development Ministry, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. District Project Officer, Women and Child Development, Raipur (C.G.)
3. Project Officer, Unified Child Development Project, Kasdol, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
4. The Collector, District Women and Child Development Raipur, Distt. Raipur (C.G.)
5. The Commissioner, Department of Women & Child Development, Raipur (C.G.)

Present : Shri P.K.Patel, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri Sanjay S. Agrawal, Government Advocate for the State.

ORAL ORDER

(Passed on 21st March, 2007)

According to the petitioner, she was appointed as Supervisor in the office of Women and Child Development Project at Pushprajgarh, District Shahdol on 19-6-1987. At present, she is working in the office of the Child Development Project, Bhatapara, District Raipur. The grievance made out in this writ petition filed by her under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is that she has completed her period of probation of two years, but the respondents have not regularized her services and they have still continued her on probation, without issuing any order to that effect. Further, the pay of the petitioner has not been fixed by the respondents and they have also deprived the petitioner from her salary payable from December, 1993 to August, 1994.

(24)

(2) The petitioner in this writ petition has stated that before approaching this Court, she had already filed representations dated 11-9-1998, 27-1-1997 and 4-9-2002 before the respondents and those representations have not been considered by the respondents in spite of long lapse of time. Therefore, the petitioner is before this Court seeking an appropriate direction to the respondents.

(3) In my opinion, the responsible respondents ought to have considered the grievances of the petitioner made out in her representations. Since that has not been done, a direction requires to be issued to the respondents.

(4) Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. A direction is issued to the competent authorities, before whom the representations said to have been filed by the petitioner are pending, to consider the same and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law, within a reasonable time. Ordered accordingly.

Sd/-
Chief Justice